

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28**E-filed: 5/26/09**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX  
SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.,  
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR U.K. LTD., and  
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR  
DEUTSCHLAND GmbH,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RAMBUS INC.,

Defendant.

No. C-00-20905 RMW

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART REQUEST TO REDACT  
PORTIONS OF ORDER GRANTING  
HYNIX'S MOTION TO STAY EXECUTION  
OF JUDGMENT

On May 14, 2009, the court filed under seal its order granting with conditions Hynix's motion to stay execution of judgment and directing that on-going royalties be paid into an escrow account. The order allowed the parties seven days to present a meritorious request that certain portions of the order be redacted from the publicly filed copy of the order, absent which the unredacted order would be publicly filed.

Hynix requested redactions on page 3 of the order: portions of lines 2-3, which discussed certain surety terms for the issuance of a bond, and portions of lines 15-16 which identified the specific properties offered as security to Rambus. Hynix's counsel stated that the information is confidential financial and business information of Hynix and was filed under seal in connection with

ORDER  
C-00-20905-RMW  
TER

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1 the motion. Rambus objected to the proposed redactions, arguing that the nature of the security  
2 underlying the bond and the specific identification of the properties offered as security is not a  
3 sensitive business matter, similar in type to the contingency plans which Hynix has routinely  
4 announced during earnings calls. Rambus cites Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447  
5 F.23d 1172, 1178-81 (9th Cir. 2005), for the proposition that a party's subjective preference to keep  
6 facts confidential is not enough to justify sealing them, and instead, that there must be an objective  
7 and cognizable reason that overcomes the public's interest in access to judicial records and the  
8 contents of court decisions.

9 In response, Hynix argues that Rambus has waived its objection to sealing these facts  
10 because it did not object when Hynix sought to have the documents containing such facts submitted  
11 under seal in connection with the underlying motion. Since the issue involves public access,  
12 however, Rambus' alleged waiver is not dispositive. Hynix also contends that the redactions are  
13 proper because the information is confidential and sensitive business information that has not been  
14 publicly disclosed.

15 The Ninth Circuit in Kamakana stressed the presumption in favor of the public's access to  
16 judicial records, finding that absent compelling reasons justifying maintaining documents under seal,  
17 documents submitted in connection with dispositive motions should be open to the public. The  
18 "compelling reasons" standard is a higher standard than the mere "good cause" requirement under  
19 Rule 26(c) in connection with non-dispositive motions and protective orders governing discovery.

20 Hynix was obligated to present "articulable facts" identifying the interests favoring continued  
21 secrecy and to show that these specific interests overcame the presumption of access by outweighing  
22 the public interest in understanding the judicial process. Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1181 (citing Foltz  
23 v. State Farm Auto Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003), and Hagestad v. Tragesser, 49  
24 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir. 1995)). Hynix has not done so except with respect to its negotiation with  
25 the surety of the terms for the posting of the bond. The court finds that Hynix's concern that  
26 publicly revealing those negotiations could interfere with Hynix's ability to successfully negotiate  
27 favorable terms. Therefore, the request to redact the portion of page 3:2-3 is granted, pending the  
28

ORDER  
C-00-20905-RMW  
TER

1 posting of the supersedeas bond. However, once the bond has been posted, there would not appear  
2 to be a need to maintain confidentiality. A fully unredacted copy of the May 14, 2009 order will be  
3 filed at that time.

4 The court fails to see why the identity of the properties offered by Hynix as security for the  
5 portion of the judgment not bonded cannot be disclosed at this time. Accordingly, the request to  
6 redact pages 3:15-16 is denied.

7 Therefore, a redacted copy of the May 14, 2009 order will be filed publicly, and following  
8 the posting of the supersedeas bond, an unredacted copy of the order will be publicly filed.

9  
10 DATED: 5/22/09



RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1 This document has been electronically sent to: counsel in 00-20905.

<b>Counsel</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Appearances:</b>			
		05-00334	05-02298	06-00244	00-20905
<b>Rambus:</b>					
Kathryn Kalb Anderson	Kate.Anderson@mto.com	x		x	
Peter A. Detre	<u>detrepa@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Erin C. Dougherty	<u>erin.dougherty@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Sean Eskovitz	sean.eskovitz@mto.com	x	x	x	x
Burton Alexander Gross	<u>Burton.Gross@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Keith Rhoderic Dhu Hamilton, II	keith.hamilton@mto.com	x	x	x	x
Pierre J. Hubert	<u>phubert@mckoolsmith.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Andrea Jill Weiss Jeffries	Andrea.Jeffries@mto.com	x	x	x	
Miriam Kim	<u>Miriam.Kim@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	<u>carolyn.luedtke@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Steven McCall Perry	<u>steven.perry@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Jennifer Lynn Polse	jen.polse@mto.com	x	x	x	x
Matthew Thomas Powers	<u>mpowers@sidley.com</u>	x			
Rollin Andrew Ransom	rransom@sidley.com	x	x	x	x
Rosemarie Theresa Ring	rose.ring@mto.com	x	x	x	x
Gregory P. Stone	<u>gregory.stone@mto.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com	x	x	x	x
Donald Ward	Bill.Ward@mto.com	x	x	x	
David C. Yang	david.yang@mto.com	x	x	x	x
Douglas A. Cawley	dcauley@mckoolsmith.com			x	
Scott L Cole	scole@mckoolsmith.com			x	
William Hans Baumgartner, Jr	wbaumgartner@sidley.com				x
Scott W. Hejny	shejny@sidley.com				x
Kelly Max Klaus	kelly.klaus@mto.com				x
Catherine Rajwani	crajwani@sidley.com				x
Thomas N Tarnay	ttarnay@sidley.com				x
<b>Hynix:</b>					
Theodore G. Brown , III	<u>tgbrown@townsend.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Daniel J. Furniss	<u>djfurniss@townsend.com</u>	x			x
Joseph A. Greco	<u>jagreco@townsend.com</u>	x			x
Julie Jinsook Han	JJHan@townsend.com	x	x	x	
Tomomi Katherine Harkey	tharkey@omm.com	x			x
Jordan Trent Jones	<u>jtjones@townsend.com</u>	x			x
Patrick Lynch	plynch@omm.com	x			x
Kenneth Lee Nissly	<u>kennissly@omm.com</u>	x		x	x
Kenneth Ryan O'Rourke	<u>korourke@omm.com</u>	x			x
Belinda Martinez Vega	<u>bvega@omm.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Geoffrey Hurndall Yost	gyost@thelenreid.com	x	x	x	x
Susan Gregory van Keulen	<u>svankeulen@omm.com</u>	x		x	x
Allen Ruby	ruby@allenrubylaw.com				x
<b>Micron:</b>					
Robert Jason Becher	robertbecher@quinnemanuel.com	x		x	x
John D Beynon	<u>john.beynon@weil.com</u>	x	x	x	x
Jared Bobrow	<u>jared.bobrow@weil.com</u>	x	x	x	x

ORDER  
C-00-20905-RMW

TER

**United States District Court**

For the Northern District of California

1	Yonaton M Rosenzweig	<a href="mailto:yonirosenzweig@quinnmanuel.com">yonirosenzweig@quinnmanuel.com</a>	x	x	x
2	Harold Avrum Barza	<a href="mailto:halbarza@quinnmanuel.com">halbarza@quinnmanuel.com</a>		x	
3	Linda Jane Brewer	<a href="mailto:lindabrewer@quinnmanuel.com">lindabrewer@quinnmanuel.com</a>		x	
4	Aaron Bennett Craig	<a href="mailto:aaroncraig@quinnmanuel.com">aaroncraig@quinnmanuel.com</a>	x		x
5	Leeron Kalay	<a href="mailto:kalay@fr.com">kalay@fr.com</a>		x	
6	David J. Lender	<a href="mailto:david.lender@weil.com">david.lender@weil.com</a>		x	
7	Rachael Lynn Ballard McCracken	<a href="mailto:rachaelmccracken@quinnmanuel.com">rachaelmccracken@quinnmanuel.com</a>		x	
8	Sven Raz	<a href="mailto:sven.raz@weil.com">sven.raz@weil.com</a>		x	
9	David J. Ruderman	<a href="mailto:davidruderman@quinnmanuel.com">davidruderman@quinnmanuel.com</a>		x	
10	Elizabeth Stotland Weiswasser	<a href="mailto:elizabeth.weiswasser@weil.com">elizabeth.weiswasser@weil.com</a>		x	

**Nanya:**

7	Jason Sheffield Angell	<a href="mailto:jangell@orrick.com">jangell@orrick.com</a>	x	x	x	x
8	Kristin Sarah Cornuelle	<a href="mailto:kcornuelle@orrick.com">kcornuelle@orrick.com</a>	x	x	x	
9	Chester Wren-Ming Day	<a href="mailto:cday@orrick.com">cday@orrick.com</a>		x		
10	Jan Ellen Ellard	<a href="mailto:jellard@orrick.com">jellard@orrick.com</a>	x		x	
11	Vickie L. Feeman	<a href="mailto:vfeeman@orrick.com">vfeeman@orrick.com</a>	x	x	x	
12	Robert E. Freitas	<a href="mailto:rfreitas@orrick.com">rfreitas@orrick.com</a>		x		
13	Craig R. Kaufman	<a href="mailto:hlee@orrick.com">hlee@orrick.com</a>		x		
14	Hao Li	<a href="mailto:hli@orrick.com">hli@orrick.com</a>		x		
15	Cathy Yunshan Lui	<a href="mailto:clui@orrick.com">clui@orrick.com</a>		x		
16	Theresa E. Norton	<a href="mailto:tnorton@orrick.com">tnorton@orrick.com</a>		x		
17	Mark Shean	<a href="mailto:mshean@orrick.com">mshean@orrick.com</a>		x		
18	Kaiwen Tseng	<a href="mailto:ktseng@orrick.com">ktseng@orrick.com</a>		x		

**Samsung:**

15	Steven S. Cherensky	<a href="mailto:steven.cherensky@weil.com">steven.cherensky@weil.com</a>	x	x		
16	Dana Prescott Kennedy Powers	<a href="mailto:dana.powers@weil.com">dana.powers@weil.com</a>	x	x	x	
17	Matthew Douglas Powers	<a href="mailto:matthew.powers@weil.com">matthew.powers@weil.com,</a> <a href="mailto:matthew.antonelli@weil.com">matthew.antonelli@weil.com</a>	x	x		
18	Edward Robert Reines	<a href="mailto:Edward.Reines@weil.com">Edward.Reines@weil.com</a>	x	x		x

**United States Dept. of Justice**

19	May Lee Heye	<a href="mailto:may.heye@usdoj.gov">may.heye@usdoj.gov</a>			x	
20	Eugene S. Litvinoff	<a href="mailto:eugene.litvinoff@usdoj.gov">eugene.litvinoff@usdoj.gov</a>			x	
21	Niall Edmund Lynch	<a href="mailto:Niall.Lynch@USDOJ.GOV">Niall.Lynch@USDOJ.GOV</a>				x

21 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not  
22 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program in each action.

23 **Dated:** 5/26/09 TER  
24 **Chambers of Judge Whyte**

25

26

27

28

ORDER  
C-00-20905-RMW  
TER